City of Lafayette Staff Report

For:	City Council
By:	Niroop K. Srivatsa
Date Written:	August 4, 2008
Meeting Date:	August 11, 2008
Subject:	Adoption of Resolution 2008-39 adopting the Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line (ULL) as Lafayette's ULL for the purposes of compliance with Measure J to establish a voter-approved ULL

Purpose

Adopt Resolution 2008-39 adopting the Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line (ULL) as Lafayette's ULL for the purposes of compliance with Measure J to establish a voter-approved ULL.

Background

As part of the reauthorization of Contra Costa's ½-cent transportation sales tax measure (Measure J), the Contra Costa Transportation Authority adopted a Growth Management Program (GMP) that required the establishment of a voter approved Urban Limit Line (ULL). That ULL was approved by Contra Costa County voters in November 2006 and applies to Contra Costa County and all cities/towns within the County. In Lafayette, 71.27% of the voters voted to approve the County ULL. The ULL acts as a boundary for urbanized development. Development outside the ULL is only permitted at very low densities. In Lafayette, the voter-approved Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line is coterminous with the city boundary.

Like Measure C, the Measure J sales tax will provide return-to-source funds to local jurisdictions; these funds can be used for street maintenance and improvement. Lafayette's annual share of these funds is approximately $360,000.

The GMP requires that all jurisdictions within the County adopt the voter-approved ULL by November 2009. Lafayette will fulfill that requirement by adopting the attached Resolution 2008-39.

Recommendation

Adopt Resolution 2008-39.

Attachments: Resolution 2008-39 w/exhibits

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE

IN THE MATTER OF:

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Lafayette Adopting the Contra Costa County Measure L Urban Limit Line (ULL) as Lafayette's adopted ULL for the purposes of compliance with Measure J to establish a voter-approved ULL	)))))	Resolution 2008-39

WHEREAS, the Measure J (2004) Transportation Expenditure Plan includes a Growth Management Program (GMP) which contains an urban limit line component mandating that local jurisdictions must adopt and continuously comply with a voter approved urban limit line no later than April 1, 2009 in order to receive their shares of Measure J Local Street Maintenance and Improvement Funds and to be eligible to receive Measure J Transportation for Livable Community funds; and

WHEREAS, Measure J also includes Principles of Agreement for Establishing the Urban Limit Line (the *ULL Principles*) as Attachment A to the GMP, incorporated therein by reference; and

WHEREAS, the *ULL Principles,* as amended by the Authority on November 15, 2006, state that a local jurisdiction may adopt a "County ULL," which is defined as the ULL adopted by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors and passed by the voters at a countywide election (after November, 2004); and

WHEREAS, Measure L (2006), the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisor ULL, was passed by a majority of voters in Contra Costa at the November 7, 2006 election; and

WHERAS, the Measure L ULL was also approved by a majority of the voters in the City of Lafayette at the November 7, 2006 election, as certified by the County Clerk; and

WHEREAS, the City of Lafayette wishes to adopt the Measure L ULL (refered to hereinafter as the *County ULL*) as its ULL specifically as it applies to the City of Lafayette boundaries for the purpose of compliance with the Measure J GMP; and

WHEREAS, on July 25, 2006, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors, as the lead agency for the project under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), adopted a Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2006012134) on the "November 7, 2006 General Election, Urban Limit Line Ballot Measure Sponsored by Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors;" and

WHEREAS, the Negative Declaration determined that the adoption of the Measure L ULL would not have any significant impacts on the environment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The City of Lafayette accepts, adopts, and approves, for the purposes of compliance with the Measure J GMP, the *County ULL* boundary for urban development as its applicable voter approved ULL with regard to the boundaries of City of Lafayette; and

2. Conditions for revising the physical boundary of the *County ULL* to allow the City of Lafayette to make adjustments of 30 or fewer acres, or to address issues of unconstitutional takings, or to

conform to state and federal law are set forth in Exhibit 1, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof; and

3. The City of Lafayette shall not make adjustments of greater than 30 acres to the physical boundary of the adopted *County ULL* unless those adjustments *have* been approved by the voters in accordance with the *ULL Principles*; and

4. The City of Lafayette has considered the environmental effects of the project as shown in the Negative Declaration prepared by the County and shall adopt a Notice of Determination in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines sections 15075 and 15096(i) within five working days after the approval of this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Lafayette at a regular meeting of said Council on August 11, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

Joanne Robbins, City Clerk

APPROVED:

Mike Anderson, Mayor

Attachments
Exhibit 1: Conditions for revising the physical boundary of the County ULL to allow the City of Lafayette to make adjustments of 30 or fewer acres

EXHIBIT 1

FROM: Revised Ballot Language Per Board of Supervisors Mtg. 05/16/2006

(a) a natural or man-made disaster or public emergency has occurred which warrants the provision of housing and/or other community needs within land located outside the ULL;

(b) an objective study has determined that the ULL is preventing the County from providing its fair share of affordable housing or regional housing as required by State law, and the Board of Supervisors finds that a change to the ULL is necessary and the only feasible means to enable the County to meet these requirements of State law;

(c) a majority of the cities that are party to a preservation agreement and the County have approved a change to the ULL affecting all or any portion of the land covered by the preservation agreement;

(d) a minor change to the ULL will more accurately reflect topographical characteristics or legal boundaries;

(e) an objective study has determined that a change to the ULL is necessary or desirable to further the economic viability of the east Contra Costa County Airport, and either (I) mitigate adverse aviation related to environmental or community impacts attributable to Buchanan Field, or (ii) further the County's aviation related needs;

(f) a change is required to conform to applicable California or federal law.

(g) a five (5) year ~~periodic~~ ***cyclical*** review of the ULL has determined, based on criteria and factors for establishing the ULL set forth above, that new information is available (from city or County growth management studies or otherwise) or circumstance have changed, warranting a change to the ULL.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: November 7, 2006 General Election Ballot Measure To Extend the Term of the Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line to 2026 and Establish New Procedure for Voter Approval on Expansion of the County Urban Limit Line, as sponsored by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors (County Files: GP#06-0001 and ZT#06-0001)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Contra Costa County
Community Development Department
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Patrick Roche
(925) 335-1242

4. Project Location: all of Contra Costa County

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors
651 Pine Street, Main County Admin. Bldg.
Martinez, CA 94553

6. General Plan Designation: Since the proposed action applies countywide the General Plan designations are multiple and various.

7. Zoning: Since the proposed action applies countywide the Zoning Districts are multiple and various.

8. Description of Project: A November 7, 2006 General Election Ballot Measure asking the voters of Contra Costa County to amend the Land Use and Conservation Elements of the Contra Costa County General Plan (2005-2020) and the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance (County Ordinance Code, Chapter 82-1) to[1]:

   I. Extend the term of the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance (County Ordinance Code, Chapter 82-1) and the County's Urban Limit Line to the Year 2026.

   II. During the extended term of the 65/35 Land Preservation Plan Ordinance (County Ordinance Code, Chapter 82-1) and County's Urban Limit

[1] See Exhibit One: Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors Urban Limit Line Ballot Measure attached to this Initial Study/Environmental Checklist for the complete text amendments to both the County General Plan and County Ordinance Code, Chapter 82-1.

Line, require voter approval to expand the County's Urban Limit Line by more than thirty (30) acres based on a schedule of review of the Urban Limit Line boundary every five (5) years, commencing in Year 2011, and require that in the tenth year of extended term of the County's Urban Limit Line, in Year 2016, the County shall participate with the cities in a comprehensive review of the availability of land to meet a 20-year housing and jobs needs for Contra Costa County in order to determine if adjustments to the County's Urban Limit Line of greater than 30 (thirty) acres would be necessary to meet these needs.

III. Incorporate into both General Plan and County Ordinance Code the requirement that a 4/5 vote of the Board of Supervisors is necessary to place a measure on the election ballot to expand the Urban Limit Line boundary by more than thirty (30) acres through the Year 2026.

IV. Incorporate into both the General Plan and County Ordinance Code the procedure for the scheduled review of the Urban Limit Line based on the five (5) year cycle, beginning after voter adoption in November 2006, and a required ten year review in 2016 based on a review of land availability to determine capacity to meet housing and jobs needs for the County.

V. Retain in both the General Plan and County Ordinance Code the existing procedure for change to the County's Urban Limit Line under thirty (30) acres based on a 4/5 vote of the Board of Supervisors after holding a public hearing and making at least one of seven findings, as currently proscribed in both the General Plan and County Ordinance Code, based on substantial evidence in the record.

VI. Retain the 65/35 standard for land preservation in Contra Costa County, whereby sixty-five (65) percent of the overall County land area will be retained for non-urban uses through the year 2026.

VII. Retain the protections for the County's prime agricultural land, specifically the area now designated in the General Plan as the Agricultural Core by maintaining the 40-acre

minimum parcel size and limiting uses to agricultural production or to uses incidental to agricultural production.

VIII. Approve a new Urban Limit Line Map for the General Plan, as recommended by the Board of Supervisors, which reflects the following changes [2]:

a) Incorporate the City of Antioch's voter approved Urban Limit Line, November 8, 2005 Special Election, affecting the Antioch area;

b) Incorporate the City of Pittsburg's voter approved Urban Limit Line, November 8, 2005 Special Election, affecting the Pittsburg area;

c) Incorporate the City of San Ramon's voter approved General Plan Land Use and Urban Growth Boundary map (March 2, 2002) affecting the San Ramon area;

d) Locate twenty-seven (27) acres for a public playfield as part of the Gateway (Montanera) development project in the City of Orinda on the inside of the Urban Limit Line;

e) Locate the thirty-eight (38) acres of the Pine Creek Detention basin owned by the Contra Costa Water Conservation and Flood Control District in the North Gate area on the outside of the Urban Limit Line;

f) Locate the approved Alhambra Valley Ranch residential subdivision (Subdivision No. 6443) on the inside of the Urban Limit Line, and make corresponding adjustments to the Urban Limit Line boundary along the Martinez area waterfront placing certain lands within the City of Martinez on the outside of the Urban Limit Line, as recommended by the Martinez City Council.

---

[2] See maps attached as Figure 1 and Figure 2 to this Initial Study/Environmental Checklist for graphic detail on the proposed changes to the County's Urban Limit Line Map.

g) Locate certain parcels along Marsh Creek Road in the unincorporated area of Clayton fully inside the Urban Limit Line where the existing line splits these parcels.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Contra Costa County covers approximately 733 square miles and extends from the northeastern shore of the San Francisco Bay easterly about 50 miles to San Joaquin County. Contra Costa County is bordered on the south and west by Alameda County. On the north, Contra Costa County is bordered by Solano and Sacramento counties and separated by the San Pablo and Suisun Bays, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. The western and northern portions of the County are urbanized with significant land area in industrial uses. The central portion of the County is predominantly suburban residential and commercial uses in character with industrial uses located on the riverfront of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River. The eastern portion of the County is also comprised of both suburban residential and commercial uses along with industrial uses located on the riverfront of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River. The far eastern portion of the County is predominantly in agricultural use with some suburban residential uses. Most the County's land area is comprised of non-urban uses including agriculture, parkland, watershed, and open space. The County's landform is dominated and shaped by the hilly terrain of the Diablo Range and East Bay Hills, the San Francisco-San Pablo Bays, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing, approval, or participation agreement):

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

_	Land Use and Planning	_	Transportation/ Circulation	_	Public Services
_	Population & Housing			_	Utilities & Service Systems
_	Geological Problems	_	Biological Resources		
_	Water	_	Energy & Mineral Resources	_	Aesthetics
_	Air Quality			_	Cultural Resources
_	Mandatory Findings of Significance	_	Hazards	_	Recreation
		_	Noise		
				✓	No Significant Impacts Identified

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

__✓__ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

___ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

___ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

___ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

___ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Patrick Roche
Signature

May 26, 2006
Date

Project Planner
Contra Costa County Community Development Department

SOURCES

In the process of preparing the Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following sources and references (which are available for review at the Contra Costa County Community Development Department, 651 Pine Street 4th Floor-North Wing, Martinez) were consulted and incorporated herein (where appropriate these Sources are enumerated in response to questions under Evaluation of Environmental Impacts):

1. Project Description: November 2006 Ballot Measure To Extend the Term of the Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line to 2026 and To Establish New Procedure for Voter Approval to Expand the Urban Limit Line, as sponsored by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors (draft Ballot Measure prepared by the Contra Costa County Community Development Department and County Counsel, based on adopted July 12, 2005 Board Order entitled "Report On Ballot Measure For Extension of The Urban Limit Line" and subsequent Board actions on March 7, 2006 and May 16, 2006).

2. The Contra Costa County General Plan, 2005-2020 (adopted January 18, 2005), and Initial Study and Negative Declaration (SCH# 2004122066) and the Environmental Impact Report (SCH#88071904) prepared for the comprehensive update to the Contra Costa County General Plan (approved January 1991).

3. Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, Title 8: Zoning.

4. Contra Costa County General Plan Amendment Study: Potential Modifications to the Urban Limit Line Boundary (County File: GP#99-0001) and Environmental Impact Report (SCH#99-112094), prepared by Mundie & Associates; Board Reports and Board Resolution No. 2000/366, August 1, 2000 and Board Resolution No. 2000/451, September 25, 2000, adopting General Plan Amendment involving modifications to the Urban Limit Line, and Court Decisions: Finley Tassajara Corp v. County of Contra Costa, (Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. C00-3704 and California Court of Appeals, First Appellate District, Case No. A097392).

5. Review of City General Plans, including Land Use Elements, Environmental Impact Reports for General Plans, and related documents:

   - City of Antioch General Plan (adopted November 2003)
   - City of Brentwood General Plan (adopted November 27, 2001)
   - City of Concord General Plan (adopted July 26, 1994 and as amended through April 1, 2003) and final draft Concord 2030 General Plan, Volume 1: Plan Policies
   - Town of Danville 2010 General Plan (adopted 1999)
   - City of Lafayette General Plan (adopted October 28, 2002)
   - City of Martinez General Plan (adopted 1973) and Franklin Hills Specific Plan (adopted August 5, 1987)
   - Town of Moraga 2002 General Plan (adopted June 4, 2002)
   - City of Oakley General Plan 2020 (adopted December 22, 2002)
   - City of Orinda General Plan 1987-2007 (adopted May 20, 1987)
   - City of Pittsburg General Plan 2020 (adopted August 2001)

- City of Richmond General Plan (adopted August 1994) and Land Use Map (amended May 1998)
- City of San Pablo General Plan (adopted August 1996)
- City of San Ramon General Plan 2020 and Urban Growth Boundary (approved by voters March 5, 2002)
- City of Walnut Creek General Plan – Vision 2005 (adopted February 1989) and Land Use Element Map (revised November 5, 1991) and draft General Plan 2025 (draft February 17, 2006)

6. Maps of Voter Approved City Urban Limit Line, Special Election on November 8, 2005:

    - City of Antioch

    - City of Pittsburg

7. Contra Costa County Community Development Department Resource Mapping System – U.S Geological Survey Quadrangle Sheet Panels – Benicia, Vine Hill, Honker Bay, Antioch North, Jersey Island, Richmond, Briones Valley, Walnut Creek, Clayton, Antioch South, Brentwood, Woodward Island, Las Trampas, Diablo, Tassajara, and Byron Hot Springs.

8. Contra Costa County Community Development Department Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Mapping Program.

9. Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted by the Contra Costa County Airport Land Use Commission, December 13, 2000.

10. *Draft* East Contra Costa County Habitat Plan (www.cocohcp.org) and personal communication with John Kopchik, Project Planner, 1/24/2006.

11. Contra Costa County Keynotes: Habitat Types & Rare, Endangered or Threatened Plants of Contra Costa County (prepared by Contra Costa County Community Development Department, February 1978); and Contra Costa County Watershed Atlas (prepared by Contra Costa County Community Development Department, January 2004).

12. Map of Important Farmlands in Contra Costa County, Yr. 2004 (California Department. of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program) and Map of Agricultural Preserves in Contra Costa County (Williamson Act contracts), Oct. 2004.

13. Contra Costa County Inventory of Historical Sites (prepared by Contra Costa County Community Development Department, May 1976, revised 1989, and reprinted 2001).

14. 2000 Bay Area Clean Air Plan and 1999 Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan, prepared by the Bay Area Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and, BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, revised December 1999.

15. 2004 Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List) for Contra Costa County, California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch Pittsburg and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial boundary modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development. The proposed action does not amend the County General Plan's land use map or alter policies or implementation measures in the General Plan relating to scenic resources or scenic highways. No direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Voter approval would not adversely impact scenic resources or vistas, degrade the visual character or quality, or create a new source of light and glare. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would have any significant adverse impacts on the physical environment in the area of aesthetics.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1,12)				✔
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? (Sources: 1,2,3, &12)				✔
c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1,2,5,6,7, & 12)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial boundary modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development. The proposed action does not amend the County General Plan's land use map or alter policies or implementation measures in the General Plan relating to agricultural resources, except that if approved by voters it would expressly retain and extend the term of protections for prime farmland in Contra Costa County. Since the proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development or alter the General Plan's land use map, it would not directly or indirectly result in the conversion of agricultural land or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with the County's Williamson Act Program. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would have any significant adverse impacts on agricultural resources.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1, 14)				✔
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1,14)				✔
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 1,14)				✔
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1,14)				✔
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 1,14)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to new procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial boundary modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development. The proposed action does not amend the County General Plan's land use map or alter policies or implementation measures in the General Plan relating to air quality. No direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would have any significant adverse impacts on air quality.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,10, &11)				✔
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,10, &11)				✔
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,10, &11)				✔
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: : 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,10, &11)				✔
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,10, &11)				✔
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? (Source: 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,10, &11)				✔

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – continued

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. The proposed action would not change or alter County General Plan policies or other regulations aimed at protecting biological resources, nor would the proposed action change land use designations under the land use map to the General Plan. The action would not directly or indirectly impact protected species or habitats or natural communities since no development is being approved, nor is there a change in County policies or regulations relating to biological resources that would facilitate new development as a result voter approval. There is a *draft* Habitat Conservation/Natural Communities Conservation Plan for eastern Contra Costa County that has been prepared and released for public comment. It is anticipated that the *final* Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan will address the matters pertaining to habitat protection in relation to growth and development in eastern Contra Costa County over the next 30 years, including area inside and outside the present County Urban Limit Line. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would have any significant adverse impacts on biological resources.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 (Sources: 1,2,4,5,7, &13)				✔
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,7, &13)				✔
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature? (Sources:)				✔
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,7, &13)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. The proposed action would not change or alter historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources in the County since no development is being approved, nor is there a change in County General Plan policies or other regulations relating to cultural resources that would result from voter approval. Also, voter approval would not result in disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, since no new development would be approved or facilitated. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would have any significant adverse impacts on cultural resources.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
	2. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
	3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
	4. Landslides? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1998), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, & 8)				✔

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – continued

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. The proposed action would not change or alter County General Plan policies or other regulations relating to geological hazards, nor would the proposed action result in any change in use designations or location of uses under the land use map in the General Plan. Voter approval of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure would not expose people or structures to geological or earthquake hazards, result in substantial soil erosion, locate structures on unstable geological unit or expansive soil creating risk to life or property, or locate septic tanks or other alternative waste disposal systems on soil incapable of supporting such waste disposal. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval result in significant and adverse geological impacts.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6, &15)				✔
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: : 1,2,4,5,6, &15)				✔
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6, &15)				✔
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65862.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources:1,2,4,5,6, &15)				✔
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6, & 9)				✔
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6, & 9)				✔
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔

h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for changing the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Since the action does not approve or facilitate development, or change County General Plan policies or other regulations relating to hazards or hazardous material or change the use designations or location of uses under the General Plan land use map, it would not create or contribute to hazards. The action would not result in the transportation of hazardous material, it would not result in use or disposal of hazardous materials, and it would not release hazardous materials into the environment. Furthermore, the action would not result in an increased risk of air safety hazards, and it does not expose people or structures to wildland fires since it does not approve or facilitate development (e.g. change use designations or location of uses under the land use map in the General Plan). Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would have a direct or indirect physical impact on the environment related to hazards or hazardous materials.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,&6)				✔
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,& 6)				✔
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				✔
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface run-off in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				✔
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				✔
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				✔
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				✔

	(Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				✔
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				✔
j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,6,7, &8)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Since no new development is being approved under the measure, and the measure does not facilitate new development by changing use designations or location of uses under the General Plan land use map, the proposed action would not result in the violation of water quality or waste discharge requirements, it would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge of an aquifer or water table, it would not alter existing drainage patterns, create new runoff, it would not place structures within a flood hazard area, and it would not expose people or structures to flooding by result of a dam/levee or tsunami/mudflow. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would have a direct or indirect impact on the physical environment related to hydrology and water quality.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1,2,5,& 6)				✔
b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or the regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1,2,3,5,& 6)				✔
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1,2,5, 6 &10)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. It would also amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. See Figures 1 and 2 to this Initial Study for more details. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the County's Urban Limit Line ballot measure. The proposed action does not approve or facilitate new development because it does not change use designations or location of uses under the land use map to the General Plan, nor does it result in the rezoning of land in the unincorporated area. Since the action does not fundamentally change land use or zoning designations, it would not in any way facilitate new development in the unincorporated area.

Besides the procedural changes relating to future expansion of the Urban Limit Line, the proposed action involves voter approval to conform the County's Urban Limit Line map, which is incorporated into the Land Use Element, to the recently voter-approved Urban Limit Line maps for the cities of Antioch and Pittsburg (November 8, 2005 Special Election), and the previously voter-approved Urban Growth Boundary for San Ramon (March 2, 2002). This action would acknowledge the majority vote in those cities

and the determination by a majority of those voters that certain land areas now in the unincorporated area are within the city's voter-approved Urban Limit Line, meaning that it is reasonably foreseeable these areas will become urbanized under the city's land use jurisdiction when annexed to the city. The cities of Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon may pursue annexation of those unincorporated areas within their respective voter-approved Urban Limit Line without the risk of losing return to source funds from the countywide ½ cent transportation sale tax program because as specified under the Growth Management Program approved voters in November 2004 under Measure J they now have voter-approved Urban Limit Lines. While this provides no guarantee that certain unincorporated areas now within a city voter-approved Urban Limit Line will or should be approved for annexation, it does mean that there is no loss of important transportation funding that would inhibit them from pursuing annexation. In fact, there are recent examples providing evidence it would be more reasonably foreseeable that certain unincorporated areas now within a city voter-approved Urban Limit Line will be developed to urban uses under city land use jurisdiction, including :

- City of Antioch – Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Roddy Ranch Annexation, issued on 1/16/2006, the project addressed by this EIR is the proposed annexation of the Roddy Ranch Annexation Area into the municipal boundary of the City of Antioch and into the service area boundary of the Delta Diablo Sanitation District. The project also encompasses the planned provision of urban services to the Roddy Annexation Area. The Annexation Area is a 918-acre area that was the subject of a voter-approved initiative known as Measure K, which was passed by the City's electorate in November 2005. Measure K created a City urban limit line (the "Urban Limit Line"), beyond which future City development is restricted.

- City of Pittsburg – Notice of Public Hearing before the Pittsburg Planning Commission on 5/23/2006, on the proposed Mirant Power Plant Annexation General Plan Amendment and Prezoning, This is a city-initiated project to amend the Pittsburg General Plan land use designations and/or prezone approximately 1300 acres of 17 parcels located north of Willow Pass Road and south of Suisun Bay. This unincorporated area was included in Pittsburg's Urban Limit Line approved by the city's voters in November 2005.

- City of San Ramon – San Ramon is processing various land use entitlement applications for the Faria Ranch Project within the city's Northwest Specific Plan Area for development within their Urban Growth Boundary. The proposal entails the subdivision of 448 acres for the development of 400 single family residences, 84 townhouses, 216 condominiums, and 86 senior housing units. This project would also involve annexation of certain unincorporated land area, but within the city's Urban Growth Boundary.

Consequently, the action to conform the County's Urban Limit Line to the cities' line would not make it more likely that these unincorporated areas would develop to an urban use, but would reflect the reality that these areas will likely develop under the city's jurisdiction. This prospective change in the physical environment would not be a result of action by the County, because until such time as annexation occurs the land uses designations or location of land uses under the land use map to the County General Plan will not change; however, the change would result from actions approved by those respective cities following annexation. The County has never received any requests to change General Plan land use designations in these locations.

The procedural changes for future expansion of the Urban Limit Line and revisions to the County's Urban Limit Line map under the proposed ballot measure would be internally consistent with the Land Use Element and other elements to the General Plan. Based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence that voter approval would result in physically dividing an established community, conflict with applicable land use plans or policies, and it would not conflict with an applicable (adopted) Habitat Conservation Plan.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
b.	Result in the loss or availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Since no new development is being approved under the measure, and the measure does not facilitate new development (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses under the General Plan land use map), the proposed action would not result in a loss or availability of mineral resources. Also, the proposed action does not change County General Plan policies or other regulations aimed at the protection and utilization of mineral resources. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence of direct or indirect physical impact on the environment related to mineral resources.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,& 6)				✔
b.	Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,& 6)				✔
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,& 6)				✔
d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1,2,4,5,& 6)				✔
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, 6, &9)				✔
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, 6, &9)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XI. NOISE – continued

It would also amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Since no new development is being approved under the measure, and the measure does not facilitate new development (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses under the General Plan land use map), the proposed action would not result in exposing people to excessive noise levels. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence of direct or indirect physical impact on the environment related to noise.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, &6)				✔
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, &6)				✔
c.	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, &6)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would both amend the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch and Pittsburg) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Voter approval would not induce population growth because the measure neither approves development, nor grants land use entitlements, nor facilitates new development (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses under the General Plan land use map). New development would not occur as a result of the measure's approval. Voter approval would not result in the displacement of existing housing or people because the measure does not propose development and development would occur as a result of the measure's approval. Additionally, voter approval would not change County General Plan land use map or policies regarding the location of urban uses or the intensity of urban uses (e.g. housing density) in the unincorporated areas of the County. The proposed action would not substantially alter the County General Plan's assumptions about population or the distribution of population in the County. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence of direct or indirect physical impact on the environment related to population and housing.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				
	1. Fire Protection?				✓
	2. Police Protection?				✓
	3. Schools?				✓
	4. Parks?				✓
	5. Other public facilities?				✓

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch and Pittsburg) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. The proposed action does not amend the General Plan land use map (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses), nor would the proposed action alter existing policies or measures relating to the provision of public services in the unincorporated area. The proposed action would not involve or require the physical alteration of governmental facilities. Since voter approval of the ballot measure does not approve or facilitate development (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses under the General Plan land use map), , the proposed action would not induce population growth requiring new or expanded public services. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence of direct or indirect impact on the physical environment related to public services.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XIV. RECREATION

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would amend both the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch and Pittsburg) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. The proposed action does not amend the General Plan land use map (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses), nor would the proposed action alter existing policies or measures relating to the provision of recreation services in the unincorporated area. The proposed action would not involve or require the construction of new recreational facilities. Also, voters are not being asked to approve new development, nor are the voters being asked to facilitate new development, that would induce population growth requiring new or expanded recreational facilities. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence of direct or indirect impact on the physical environment related to recreation.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
b.	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
f.	Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
g.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – continued

DISCUSSION:

The proposed action if approved by voters would both amend the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for changing the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. Voters are not being asked to approve new development or to facilitate subsequent approval of new development (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses under the General Plan land use map). Besides the procedural changes for future expansion of the Urban Limit Line, the proposed action involves voter approval to conform the County's Urban Limit Line map, which is incorporated into the Land Use Element, to the voter-approved Urban Limit Line maps for the cities of Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon. This action would acknowledge the majority vote in those cities and the determination by those voters that certain land areas now in the unincorporated area are within the City's voter-approved Urban Limit Line, meaning that they would eventually become annexed and urbanized under the City's land use jurisdiction (for more discussion on the reasonably foreseeable development of unincorporated lands under city land use jurisdiction where there is a city voter-approved Urban Limit Line, see DISCUSSION under IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING, page 22). Therefore, the proposed action would not alter the existing transportation system (traffic patterns, roadway, rail lines, bus routes, parking, etc.) or induce traffic from new development placing new demand on the existing transportation system. Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence of direct or indirect impact on the physical environment related to transportation/traffic.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
c.	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources:)				✔
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔
g.	Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1,2,4,5, & 6)				✔

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – continued

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would both amend the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend the text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for expanding the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps (Antioch and Pittsburg) and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map, as recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action does not confer any land use entitlement or approval of development, and no direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. The proposed action does not amend the General Plan land use map (e.g. change land use designations or location of land uses), nor would the proposed action alter existing policies or measures relating to the provision of utilities and service systems in the unincorporated area. Voter approval of the ballot measure would not require the construction of new utilities or service systems. Since voter approval of the ballot measure does not approve development, nor would it occur as a result of voter approval, the proposed action would not induce population growth requiring expanded or new utilities or service systems Consequently, based on a review of the proposed Urban Limit Line ballot measure there is no substantial evidence of adverse impacts on the physical environment related to utilities and service systems.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				✔
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				✔
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✔

SUMMARY:
No Impact.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed action if approved by voters would both amend the General Plan and Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code. Voter approval would specifically extend the term of the Urban Limit Line to Year 2026, amend text in the Land Use Element relating to procedures for changing the Urban Limit Line, while making corresponding amendments to Chapter 82-1, 65/35 Land Preservation Plan, Contra Costa County Ordinance Code, and it would amend the County's Urban Limit Line Map in the General Plan to reflect voter approved city Urban Limit Line maps and to make other non-substantial modifications to the County's Urban Limit Line Map recommended to the voters by the Board of Supervisors. The proposed action neither confers any land use entitlement or development approval, nor facilitates development by changing the land use designations or location of land uses under the General Plan land use map. No direct or indirect physical construction would result from the voter approval of the ballot measure. The proposed action will have no significant physical effects on the environment, either directly or indirectly.